



MINUTES
Regular Meeting of the
Heritage Preservation Board
Tuesday, February 9, 2010, 7:00 PM
Edina Community Room
4801 50th Street West

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Chris Rofidal, Lou Blemaster, Arlene Forrest, Connie Fukuda, Jean Rehkamp Larson, and Joel Stegner

MEMBERS ABSENT: Bob Kojetin, Bob Schwarzbauer, and Elizabeth Montgomery

STAFF PRESENT: Joyce Repya

I. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES: January 12, 2010

Member Blemaster moved approval of the minutes from the January 12, 2010 meeting. Member Forrest seconded the motion. All voted aye. The motion carried.

II. COUNTRY CLUB DISTRICT: Certificate of Appropriateness

A. H-10-02 4519 Arden Avenue, Edina, MN

- New Detached Garage
- New Front Entry Portico

Planner Repya explained that the subject property is located on the east side of the 4500 block of Arden Avenue. The existing home, an American Colonial Revival, was constructed in 1942 and currently has a 2-car detached garage, constructed in 1964 that is accessed by a driveway on the north side of the property.

The Certificate of Appropriateness request is two-fold; including a new detached 2 car garage, as well as a new front entry portico. Ms. Repya commended that the Board consider each request separately.

DETACHED GARAGE:

A 2-story addition is proposed for the rear of the home for which a COA is not required. However, the addition will necessitate removing the existing 550 sq. ft. detached garage which is set approximately 20 feet from the rear lot line and 7 feet from the wall of the proposed addition. A new 484 sq. ft. detached garage is proposed to be set back three feet from the rear and side lot lines.

The new 2-stall detached garage is proposed to measure 22' x 22' feet in area. The design of the structure is proposed to compliment the American Colonial Revival architectural style of the home with James Hardie lap siding, and an asphalt shingled roof to match the house. Attention to detail with windows and/or doors is demonstrated on all four elevations.

Ms. Repya observed that the initial plan presented (Plan "B") demonstrated a building height at peak of 21'8", however, after meeting with the Planner and learning that the maximum height of the garage should be no taller than 10% higher than the average of the neighboring detached garages; it was determined that with a 24' garage to the north (approved by a COA in 2004), and a flat roof 11' garage to the south, the height of the proposed garage should not exceed 19.25'.

Considering the need to lower the height of the garage, the pitch was reduced from a 12/12/ pitch to a 9/12 pitch, lowering the peak height to 18' 11" (Plan "A").

A unique feature to the site, and an important element to considering when reviewing the proposed plan is the four foot change in grade from the front of the garage to the rear of the structure. Because the garage is set into the grade at the rear of the property, the height at the front of the garage is four feet taller than at the rear of the garage. Due to the grade change from the front to the back of the structure; one should also average the height of the building which would provide a 16'11" average height at peak for Plan "A" (the revised plan); and 19'8" average height for Plan "B", which is the homeowner's preferred plan.

Consultant Vogel reviewed both Plan "A" and "B" for the garage and opined that both plans meet the requirements of the District Plan of Treatment with respect to placement, size, proportions, massing, and architectural character. He added that he would recommend approval of the garage plan

Planner Repya recommended approval of garage Plan "B" with an average height at peak of 19'8". Findings supporting the recommendation included:

- The plans provided with subject request clearly illustrate the scale and scope of the proposed garage.
- The proposed garage is consistent with garages previously approved in the District.
- Comparative plans were provided demonstrating the different design elements required with height variations.
- The reduced height of Plan "A" causes the windows on the front and rear elevation to be scrunched into the peak of the gable; losing the molding and keystone above the windows.

Conditions to the recommendation included:

- Subject to the plans presented.
- The condition that a year built (2010) plaque or sign is placed on the new detached garage.

Jacqueline & Kevin Bidgood, 4519 Arden Avenue, owners of the property advised the Board that they would prefer the taller garage because the new garage at 484 square feet will be 66 square feet smaller than the one it is replacing, and the additional height will provide storage space they will lose on the garage floor. They added that they believe the taller garage looks better than the lower profile design.

Member Rehkamp Larson agreed that it would not be fair to consider the adjacent flat

roof garage in the height criteria, noting that in the future, a replacement garage with a pitched roof would be likely. She added that the 19'8" height proposed with Plan "B" is consistent with the heights of garages previously approved by the HPB.

Member Forrest appreciated the smaller footprint of the proposed garage and agreed that the need for more storage space is reasonable.

Motion & Vote: Detached Garage

Member Forrest moved approval of the new garage - Plan "B" with a 19'8" height at peak. Member Stegner seconded the motion. All voted aye. The motion carried.

NEW FRONT ENTRY PORTICO:

Continuing with the Certificate of Appropriateness request, Planner Repya explained that in addition to the detached garage, a new 68 square foot front entry portico is planned which requires a COA because it is a structural change to the street facing façade of the home. The design includes 12 inch square colonial style columns, crown and dental molding, and a flat roof surrounded by a 2 foot high wood railing. Pilasters consistent with the style of the portico columns are provided on either side of the entry door. The roof will project 5'8" from the wall of the home, and the concrete entry stoop will project 6 feet into the front yard. The overall size and proportion are in keeping with similar front entries found in the neighborhood.

Ms. Repya explained that the homeowners have the original plans for the home dating back to 1940 which have influenced the design work undertaken for their home. When viewing the plans, it was discovered that a very similar front entry portico and brick cladding for the exterior walls had been planned; however when the home was built, the builder deviated from the plan deleting the portico, and using lap siding instead of brick.

In a memo provided by Consultant Vogel, he reported that after reviewing the plans he believed that the new work would be compatible in size, scale, building material, and architectural character with the historic house. Furthermore, no significant historic architectural features will be removed or destroyed, and the new additions and exterior alterations should not impair the historic significance or integrity of nearby historic homes.

Mr. Vogel also reported the Secretary of the Interior's guidelines for rehabilitation clearly state façade alterations should be considered appropriate when new additions are kept to a minimum and designed to be compatible with the character of the historic building and the neighborhood. Porches in a variety of forms frequently occur on Colonial Revival style homes throughout the Country Club District, almost always as part of symmetrically balanced facades with centered, accentuated front entrances. Porches with flat roofs supported by columns, similar to the design of the proposed new porch at 4519 Arden, are also common nation-wide on suburban Colonial style homes built during the early 20th century. Mr. Vogel added that the proposed front portico meets the relevant preservation standards for rehabilitation of historic homes, and recommended

approval of the COA request.

Planner Repya concurred with Mr. Vogel's observations and recommended approval of the plans for the front entry portico. Findings supporting the recommendation include:

- The front entry portico will compliment the architectural style of the home and not be detrimental to the adjacent historic structures.
- The original plans for the home were considered when designing the portico.
- The information provided supporting the subject Certificate of Appropriateness meets the requirements of the Plan of Treatment and Zoning Ordinance.

Conditions associated with the approval recommendation include:

- Subject to the plans presented.

The homeowner's Kevin & Jacqueline Bidgood shared the original building plans with the Board. Board members were impressed that the original plans included a front entry portico and brick siding.

Member Rehkamp Larson commented the 12" posts on the portico and 6" posts on the top railing area too chunky, adding that 10" to 8" posts for the portico and 4" posts on the top railing would be preferable. Referring to the original plans shared by the homeowner, Rehkamp Larson pointed out that the details were much finer and appeared more historic – concluding that getting the right balance is important.

The applicant's architect, Terry Scholz commented that he believed that the narrower posts would be weak and not preferable.

Member Rofidal commented that his first impression when viewing the plan was that it looked big when compared to the house. He further opined that the front elevation of the house appears flat and plain, as though something is missing. A new front entry portico will be a good addition.

Member Forrest observed that the project will provide more substance to the home.

Member Blemaster commented that she did not feel the Board should re-design a project.

Motion & Vote: Front Entry Portico

Member Stegner moved approval of the new front entry portico subject to the plans presented. Member Blemaster seconded the motion. Members Fukuda, Forrest, Blemaster, Stegner and Rofidal voted aye. Member Rehkamp Larson voted nay. The motion carried.

III. **COMMUNITY COMMENT:** None

IV. **LEGACY GRANT:** Update - Tupa Park ADA Improvements

Planner Repya reported that architects affiliated with Consultant Vogel's firm have inspected the existing handicapped ramping system that connects the Cahill School with the Grange Hall. There is a general opinion that the ramp, constructed at least 15 years ago is inefficient and detracts from the historic building, hence the Consultant Vogel has directed the architects to look at alternative locations for handicapped accessibility to both buildings. Park Director John Keprios and Park Superintendent Vince Cockriel have been involved in the discussions and agree that a more efficient and appealing design is needed. Superintendent Cockriel has pointed out that the timing is perfect since the ramp is in need of maintenance. The City has provided the architects site information, and a plan is currently in the works.

Chair Rofidal asked who would be paying for the design. Ms. Repya explained that she understands that the architects are providing this plan to Consultant Vogel's firm as an example of their work. If down the road, the Legacy Grant is approved, the design work could be folded into the project. Ms. Repya added that Mr. Vogel will have more information at the next meeting.

Board member thanked Ms. Repya for the report and agreed that they looked forward to seeing more information on this project. No formal action was taken.

V. MORNINGSIDE BUNGALOW STUDY : Update

Planner Repya reported that Consultant Vogel was to have provided an update to the Board, however due to his inability to attend the meeting; the update will be continued until the next meeting.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS:

A. 4602 Bruce Avenue – Minor change to a COA

Planner Repya reminded the Board that on April 14, 2009 a Certificate of Appropriateness was approved at 4602 Bruce Avenue to construct a new home on the site. Andy Porter, the owner and builder has reported that a prospective buyer of the new home has asked for a wood burning fireplace. To accommodate the request, a chimney is required on the north side of the home that is shown to simply project from the roof. The only change required on the north elevation would be to separate two double hung windows to accommodate the fireplace. Mr. Porter provided plans that demonstrated the home as approved as well as with the proposed chimney.

The Board briefly discussed the proposed change all agreed that the change was very minor and did not interfere with the historic integrity of the home, nor would it have an

impact on any of the surrounding properties. Member Rehkamp Larson moved approval of the request to add a chimney to the new home plan originally approved on April 14, 2009, subject to the plans provided to the Board. Member Stegner seconded the motion. All voted aye. The motion carried.

B. Changes to a Certificates of Appropriateness

Board members discussed the fact that subtle changes to a plan, particularly for a new home are not uncommon. It has been suggested that an administrative approval by Planning staff and Consultant Vogel would be efficient from a time standpoint for both the property owner and the HPB, however, currently there is not a procedure set in place.

Member Stegner observed that in order to provide consistent and fair regulations, language needs to be devised that provides direction for all. Board members agreed with Stegner and decided to come to the next meeting with ideas for criteria to establish how and when an administrative approval would be appropriate. Planner Repya agreed to research preservation commissions from other communities to see if any have administrative approval policies. No formal action was taken.

VII. ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Chair Rofidal made the following announcements:

1. March 10th Boards and Commissions Dinner 5:00 p.m. at Braemar Club House
Invitations will be mailed shortly.
2. A call for Heritage Award Nominations has been sent to the Sun Current for publication. The deadline for nominations is Tuesday, April 6th with the HPB deciding on the winner at the April 13th meeting. The City Council will make the award presentation at a meeting in May which is National Preservation Month.

VIII. NEXT MEETING DATE: March 9, 2010

IX. ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 8:10 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Joyce Repya